

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject patent application and for finding patentable material in the claims.

Applicants hereby withdraw a benefit for claiming priority to prior applications.

Response to Double Patenting Rejection

Applicants respectfully traverse the double patenting rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Response to Claims 122-159

Reconsideration of Claims 122-159 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,734,563 is requested based on the following remarks.

=====

As previously added, independent claim 122 is recited below:

122. An electronic component comprising:
multiple I/O circuits;
an interconnecting structure;
a passivation layer over said interconnecting structure; and

an upper interconnecting structure over said passivation layer and connecting said multiple I/O circuits.

As previously added, independent claim 140 is recited below:

140. An electronic component comprising:
a semiconductor circuit;
a first I/O circuit;
a second I/O circuit;
an interconnecting structure connecting said semiconductor circuit and said first I/O circuit;
a passivation layer over said interconnecting structure; and
an upper interconnecting structure over said passivation layer and connecting said first and second I/O circuits.

=====

Applicant respectfully asserts that the electronic components claimed in claims 122 and 140 comprise some subject matter not disclosed in the patented claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,734,563, hereinafter called as '563.

Applicant considers that the subject matter of "an upper interconnecting structure over a passivation layer connecting multiple I/O circuits", claimed in claims 122 and 140, is not disclosed in the patented claims and in '563. Claims 122 and 124 should be patentably distinct from the disclosure in '563.

Applicant does not agree with the Examiner's opinion of "Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applicant's claims have only been written in a different manner but contain all the elements disclosed in the patented claims" ~ *See the fourth paragraph in page 2, in the Office Action mailed Sep. 9, 2005*
~ The subject matter of "an upper interconnecting structure over a passivation layer connecting

multiple I/O circuits”, claimed in claims 122 and 140, is not disclosed in the patented claims and in ‘563. As a result, the Examiner’s consideration of “the applicant’s claims containing all the elements disclosed in the patented claims” is incorrect. Withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit independent claims 122 and 140 should not be deemed as double patenting, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 123-139 and 141-159 should not be deemed as double patenting, and should be allowed as well.

Response to Claims 160-171

Reconsideration of Claims 160-171 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,495,442 is requested based on the following remarks.

=====

As previously added, independent claim 160 is recited below:

160. A method of fabricating an electronic component, comprising:
providing a semiconductor wafer comprising multiple I/O circuits, an interconnecting structure and a passivation layer, said passivation layer being over said interconnecting structure; and
forming an upper interconnecting structure over said passivation layer, wherein said upper interconnecting structure connects said multiple I/O circuits.

=====

Applicant respectfully asserts that the method claimed in claim 160 comprises some subject matter not disclosed in the patented claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,495,442, hereinafter called as '442.

Applicant considers that the subject matter that “an upper interconnecting structure formed over a passivation layer connects multiple I/O circuits”, claimed in claim 160, is not disclosed in the patented claims and in '442. Claim 160 should be patentably distinct from the disclosure in '442.

Applicant does not agree with the Examiner's opinion of “Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applicant's claims have only been written in a different manner but contain all the elements disclosed in the patented claims” ~ *See the last paragraph in page 2, in the Office Action mailed Sep. 9, 2005* ~ The subject matter that “an upper interconnecting structure formed over a passivation layer connects multiple I/O circuits”, claimed in claim 160, is not disclosed in the patented claims and in '442. As a result, the Examiner's consideration of “the applicant's claims containing all the elements disclosed in the patented claims” is incorrect. Withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit independent claim 160 should not be deemed as double patenting, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 161-171 should not be deemed as double patenting, and should be allowed as well.

CONCLUSION

Some or all of the pending claims are believed to be in condition for Allowance, and that is so requested.

It is requested that should Examiner Owens not find that the Claims are now Allowable that he call the undersigned at 845 452-5863 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SBA', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg. No. 37,761